

3 1761 11630756 2

CAI
YL16
- T23

Government
Publications

Television and the House
of Commons

~~75c~~

Background Paper

TELEVISION AND THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS

James R. Robertson
Law and Government Division

March 1990
Revised June 1993



Library of
Parliament
Bibliothèque
du Parlement

Research
Branch

The Research Branch of the Library of Parliament works exclusively for Parliament, conducting research and providing information for Committees and Members of the Senate and the House of Commons. This service is extended without partisan bias in such forms as Reports, Background Papers and Issue Reviews. Research Officers in the Branch are also available for personal consultation in their respective fields of expertise.

©Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1994
Available in Canada through
your local bookseller
or by mail from
Canada Communication Group -- Publishing
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Catalogue No. YM32-2/242-1993-06E
ISBN 0-660-15477-3

AUG - 3091

CE DOCUMENT EST AUSSI
PUBLIÉ EN FRANÇAIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
THE DEVELOPMENT OF TELEVISION AND RADIO BROADCASTING	2
THE EFFECT OF BROADCASTING ON THE HOUSE OF COMMONS	4
THE COOK COMMITTEE REPORT	7
HOUSE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	11
REGULATION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY CHANNEL	13
THE PARLIAMENTARY CHANNEL: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS	14
CONCLUSIONS	16
BIBLIOGRAPHY	16



CANADA

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

TELEVISION AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

INTRODUCTION

Broadcasting of the proceedings of the Canadian House of Commons began in the autumn of 1977 after years of study and debate. At that time, the Canadian House of Commons was a pioneer in this area, since very few legislatures were permitting cameras to film their proceedings, except for special events. The idea of gavel-to-gavel coverage was unique.

Today, legislatures in over 80 countries permit some form of broadcasting of proceedings.⁽¹⁾ The success of the Canadian experiment has inspired other legislative bodies to allow broadcasting, with the House of Commons often providing the model. At the same time, many of these legislatures have gone beyond the Canadian precedent, either because they have learned from the Canadian experience, or because they have different traditions, concerns or priorities.

In recent years, parliamentary committees have reviewed the issue of broadcasting and made recommendations that have led to important changes. In 1989, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges, Procedure and Private Members' Business undertook a major study of broadcasting of Parliament. Its report, *Watching the House at Work*, recommended that the rules for the broadcasting of procedures of the House of Commons be relaxed and that electronic media be permitted to broadcast committee proceedings. In 1991-92, the Standing Committee on House Management conducted a study of the broadcasting of committee proceedings. Its report, which was subsequently concurred in by the House, called for the videotaping and broadcast of proceedings of committees meeting in a

(1) See Inter-Parliamentary Union, *Parliaments of the World*, Second Edition, New York, 1986, Table 27, "Broadcasting/Telecasting of Parliamentary Debates," p. 807-831.

specially equipped room, with the audio portion of all other public committee proceedings being made available to the media and other persons on Parliament Hill. The Committee was also successful in relaxing the rules governing camera angles for broadcasting of House proceedings.

These studies have caused Members of Parliament, the media, and the general public to re-evaluate the role and purpose of broadcasting parliamentary proceedings. While a small minority of people, including some Members, still oppose the presence of television cameras in the chamber, the vast majority of Canadians accept parliamentary coverage as an important and very desirable service, if not a right to which they are entitled. The proposal that the televising of the House of Commons be terminated is probably not politically feasible. The expectations of the public, the desire for openness in government, and the important role that television plays in modern political life have removed this option.

Television today is viewed as a necessary and essential part of the House of Commons. The process whereby this enormous change occurred over such a short period of time, and the changes it has wrought in the House of Commons and in how Canadians perceive their elected representatives are some of the issues that will be addressed in this paper. The paper will also review some of the challenges that lie ahead.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TELEVISION AND RADIO BROADCASTING

The general question of radio and television broadcasting of the Canadian House of Commons was referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization in 1970, following debates in the House in 1967 and 1969. The Committee's report was tabled on 30 June 1972. It was comprehensive but somewhat cautious; the Committee summarized the arguments for and against televising debates of the House of Commons and its committees, and detailed the various alternatives to and inherent limitations of each. The Committee opted for an "electronic Hansard" approach to any televising of parliamentary proceedings; rather than journalistic coverage, radio and television broadcasting should be a faithful record of the proceedings and debates of the House in the same sense as is the Official Report of Debates ("Hansard"). This fundamental recommendation of the Committee on Procedure and

Organization has been the cornerstone of all subsequent decisions on the broadcasting activities of the House of Commons.

A federal general election in 1972 intervened before the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization could be considered or implemented. Following the election, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) conducted a feasibility study. Eventually, a motion was introduced in the House by the government on 24 January 1977. In essence, the amended terms of the motion were to approve radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, on the principles governing the publication of Hansard, and to establish a special committee under the chairmanship of the Speaker to supervise its implementation. The motion was adopted, without a recorded division, on 25 January 1977, and parliamentary broadcasting was set in motion.

Early on, the crucial decision was taken that the control of the system was to remain with the House and under the direct supervision of the Speaker acting on behalf of all Members. The actual implementation of the system took place during the summer recess in 1977, so that broadcasting could commence when Parliament resumed at the end of October. As there were few precedents, the special committee was charged with making the necessary decisions about the placement of cameras, lights, and other associated matters.

Members of Parliament were concerned about the effect that television would have on the House's proceedings; there was, for instance, a fear that tapes could be used out of context to embarrass a Member or to misrepresent what went on in the House.

At the outset, the guidelines regarding camera shots and so forth were word-of-mouth and fairly loose and unrestricted. Problems soon developed, however; as John Fraser, the current Speaker of the House, once explained it, "the directors saw the proceedings through the eyes of experienced professionals trained to produce good television. Like Foster Hewitt on *Hockey Night in Canada*, their eyes followed the puck, an approach that did not sit well with Members, especially when their team was scored against." The result was that the Speaker was inundated with complaints from Members on both sides of the House.

This led to a series of changes which, while individually quite minor, collectively created a fairly restricted broadcast format. Specifically, camera shots of Members were generally limited to the torso and head. The cameras took their cue from the Speaker, showing

only those individuals who were formally recognized by the Speaker and reverting to him or her at all other times.

The main object of broadcasting parliamentary debates is to give listeners and viewers a direct and first-hand experience of Parliament at work, as opposed to what they would otherwise receive from news reports or commentaries prepared by journalists. Traditionally, the proceedings of Parliament have been open to the general public, but for most Canadians, the opportunity to sit in the galleries and watch the proceedings live is rare; television and radio broadcasting makes parliamentary proceedings accessible to many more people. At the same time, the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings assists journalists, who often use clips in their reports.

In Canada, the presence of an extensive cable television system has helped in distributing broadcasts of the House of Commons proceedings and has made gavel-to-gavel coverage possible. The signal provided by the House of Commons is distributed via satellite to cable companies and individual satellite dish owners across the country. The cable companies in turn make the parliamentary channel available to their subscribers as part of basic cable service. Because of the widespread cabling of Canadian households, this is an extremely efficient and effective way to make the proceedings of the House of Commons available to most Canadians.

The result is that most Canadians have the option of watching the verbatim proceedings of the House of Commons. A small but dedicated audience watches the proceedings on a regular basis; others tune in occasionally or watch debates of particular interest to them.

THE EFFECT OF BROADCASTING ON THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Proposals to broadcast parliamentary proceedings have generally been received with caution by politicians. The enormous importance of television in our political system is a relatively recent phenomenon. In the early 1970s, many politicians did not appreciate or want to encourage the role played by the electronic media. Many Members of Parliament were not convinced that the status of Parliament would be enhanced by broadcasting its debates. There were also concerns that the ultimate effect might be to make Parliament's proceedings appear

mannered and trivial, that television would adversely affect the procedures and proceedings of the House, and that Members would play to the cameras.

A 1973 article, for instance, discussed a number of issues related to the broadcasting of Parliament: the trivializing effect of television, its visual distractions and distortion of reality, its impact on the French-English question, and Marshall McLuhan's suggestion that television would drive home Parliament's obsolescence. As the author of the article noted, the fundamental questions about whether television and parliamentary proceedings were meant for each other had seldom been addressed: "Is the nature of television as a medium of communication compatible with the nature of Parliament as an institution? Would television coverage of the Commons help or hinder popular understanding of, and participation in, Canadian politics?"⁽²⁾

The experience of the Canadian House of Commons with television since 1977, as well as the experience in other jurisdictions, may assist in answering such questions, although little empirical study or other analysis has been done as yet.

Many Canadians are critical of politicians, and dislike what they see of them on television. Time and again, people criticize the childishness or irrelevance of politicians, and their behaviour in the House of Commons. Many viewers are fully aware of the tactics employed by Members (such as congregating behind a speaker to make the House look full) and feel that such tactics are juvenile. Whether public attitudes to federal politicians and to Parliament have been exacerbated or not by the presence of television is difficult to say. Criticisms may be rather attributable to the general cynicism that the public feels about its political leaders. Faced with the prospect of losing the parliamentary channel, however, many Canadians react strongly, saying that it is extremely important that they be able to follow the proceedings.

Broadcasting has affected the House of Commons in a variety of ways. The Clerk of the House of Commons at the time of its introduction, Alistair Fraser, concluded that many of the difficulties anticipated did not arise, or turned out not to be as formidable as had been

(2) Peter W. Johansen, "Television Parliament: What the Commons Report Left Out," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, November 1973, Vol. VIII, No. 4, p. 39-51, at p. 40-41.

feared. "The concern over the possible rush of prima donnas anxious to usurp the floor has not occurred. Speeches remain much as they were -- neither brighter nor duller. Attendance in the House has not increased or decreased. In general, things remain very much as they were."⁽³⁾ These sentiments were echoed by James Jerome, the Speaker of the House at the time of the introduction of broadcasting; he told the staff of the United States House of Representatives Rules Committee on 29 January 1978, shortly after the introduction of television, that he did not think that it had changed the House substantially. "I am saying, to those who harboured any fears about what it might do, they can relax a little because the presence of the cameras does not change the House or its work in a very substantial way." He was, however, aware of some changes:

I do see some changes in style, but I think that it is quite natural. ... Members attempting to adjust their style of debate asking or responding to questions in order to be more effective on television. But I think that is to be expected and in any case it is probably a change for the better. In terms of behaviour generally and decorum, it's a little too early to see changes in that direction.⁽⁴⁾

Some of the changes have been relatively minor. The attire of Members is said to have improved, and certain colours and clothes (such as blue shirts) are popular because they look good on television. The old tradition of thumping on desks has been replaced by more the more genteel (and more photogenic) hand-clapping. Members must be careful not to doze off, have inappropriate expressions on their face or bury their heads in a newspaper if they are near someone who is speaking.

Many people attribute the increased importance (and, to some, irrelevance) of Question Period to the introduction of television. It is felt that the constant need for a "15-second clip" or "sound bite," and the dramatics to which Question Period lends itself have enhanced its visibility out of all proportion to its value. Whether such criticisms are supported by the evidence is not entirely clear. Question Period tends to receive considerable attention

(3) Alistair Fraser, "Televising the Canadian House of Commons," *The Table*, 1979, Vol. XLVII, p. 66-71, at p. 70.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 71.

whether it is televised or not: it deals with topical issues, consists of a dialogue of sorts rather than long speeches, and is good political theatre. It is also the one period of the day when the House is full, and when the party leaders are in attendance. Moreover, most viewers, if they watch only part of the proceedings of the House, will watch Question Period.

It should be noted that the broadcasting of Parliament has greatly assisted the news-gathering task of the media. Before the introduction of television, most news reports relied on Members repeating their speeches or comments outside the House of Commons. Today, it is far more likely that actual audio-visual clips from Question Period or debates will be used in news reports.

THE COOK COMMITTEE REPORT

In 1989, a consortium of cable companies and the CBC jointly proposed a new public affairs channel to be known as CPaC. This specialty cable channel would have incorporated the proceedings of the House of Commons and committees, where available, into public affairs programming, along with proceedings of royal commissions, inquiries, court hearings and provincial legislatures. It precipitated a wide-ranging review of the broadcasting of the House of Commons. After 12 years of broadcasting, it was opportune and appropriate to re-evaluate and re-assess the experience, and to consider possible changes.

The Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges, Procedure and Private Members' Business, under the chairmanship of Chuck Cook, M.P., spent nine months in 1989 studying the whole question of broadcasting and the House of Commons. The Committee heard from numerous witnesses, consulted extensively, and travelled to Washington and Toronto to see the broadcasting operations of the U.S. Congress and Ontario Legislature respectively. The Committee issued two interim reports, with its final report being tabled in December 1989.

During the course of the Committee's deliberations, a number of major issues were identified. One of these involved the restrictions on camera angles and shots. While some observers strongly supported retention of an "electronic Hansard," others argued for a more flexible approach. It is safe to say, however, that in 1977 Members would not have agreed to the introduction of television without the safeguards inherent in an "electronic Hansard." There

were fears that training television cameras on empty seats or on MPs in unflattering situations would not produce an accurate or positive public perception of the House. As early as 1979, however, there was pressure, particularly from broadcasters, for freer and more relaxed coverage, with more wide-screen shots and other camera angles.

The effect of rather stringent guidelines and policies for broadcasting parliamentary proceedings has been criticized as being dry and stilted. The limitations of this approach are clear, since they prevent much of the drama and atmosphere of the House from being conveyed and many events of major interest from being shown. At the same time, it is often pointed out that the proceedings of the House of Commons are not designed as entertainment, nor are they staged for the benefit of viewers. Proponents of each of the two basic approaches -- an "electronic Hansard" or a news-orientated record -- both have strong arguments in their favour. At the same time, it was hoped it might be possible to achieve some compromise -- to loosen up the existing restraints, without sacrificing the serious intent of the exercise.

In its December 1989 report, the Standing Committee concluded that the existing guidelines for televising the House of Commons were unnecessarily strict. It felt that so long as television does not interfere with the proceedings, or distort the facts, there are no valid reasons for unduly restricting the cameras. Rather than attempting to formulate detailed rules or policies, however, the Committee recommended that responsibility be delegated to the producers or programming directors. As professionals, these individuals would be expected to use their judgment as to the most appropriate camera angle or shots. Their job, as the Committee expressed it, would be to convey the full flavour of the House of Commons, and to ensure that parliamentary broadcasts provided a dignified and accurate reflection of the House.

It was pointed out that more creative camera angles or shots could be used very effectively to help viewers to appreciate the proceedings more fully. Not all of these techniques would be appropriate or possible, but they ought to be considered. For instance, split screens, wide-angle shots, over-the-shoulder and reaction shots could be usefully employed in certain situations. At the same time, the Committee recognized that there were limited opportunities for different camera angles in the House. Some flexibility in shots can be usefully employed to show the context, such as where a Member sits in relation to others. Other techniques such

as split screens are inherently difficult to use and in fact are seldom employed even in legislatures where they are permitted.

It should be noted that the Standing Committee anticipated that the programming director and producers would report to the Speaker, and be subject to the overall direction and supervision of a committee of the House of Commons (and, through it, to the whole House). Thus, the House would continue to control the broadcasting of its proceedings.

Another issue that the Standing Committee addressed involved the broadcasting of committee proceedings. Much of the work of Parliamentarians is done in committees, whose importance has been greatly enhanced as a result of the procedural reforms that grew out of the 1985 Report of the Special Committee on Reform of the House of Commons (the McGrath Committee).

Interestingly, the original 1977 House of Commons motion on broadcasting provided for radio and television coverage of committees. The special committee set up to oversee the introduction of broadcasting, however, frankly observed in one of its reports that the concept of an "electronic Hansard" might not be applicable to committees. It concluded that it would be contrary to the order of the House for any committee coverage to be undertaken prior to consideration and authorization by the special committee. It was noted that there would also be a problem of selection, as many committee meetings are scheduled concurrently.

Pressure to televise committee meetings seemed to disappear for a while, but it resurfaced in recent years. Since 1977 several committees have received special permission for broadcasting from the House of Commons, but this was done on a single issue basis: the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada in 1982; the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the 1987 Constitutional Accord; the Standing Committee on Finance's hearings on the proposed Goods and Services Tax in 1989; the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture's 1989 hearings on certain order in council appointments to several cultural agencies; the 1990 Special Committee on the Proposed Companion Resolution to the Meech Lake Accord; the 1991 Special Joint Committee on the Process for Amending the Constitution of Canada; and the 1991 Special Joint Committee on a Renewed Canada. In all these cases, special permission of the House was required to allow cameras into the committee rooms. As the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges, Procedure and Private Members'

Business observed, the general consensus about these experiments has been positive; journalists and ordinary Canadians have expressed their appreciation at having electronic access to such committee hearings. The politicians involved have also been favourably impressed, and further requests for permission to televise committees have been made.

The Standing Committee recommended that each committee of the House of Commons should determine whether any meeting or meetings would be open to the electronic media; the committee could impose any arrangements that it deemed necessary to ensure the decorum of the meeting. Fixed camera positions, existing lighting and audio system and other guidelines could be imposed, so as to respect the spirit of an "electronic Hansard" and to minimize disruption to the meeting. Such guidelines have been successful in other jurisdictions where legislative committees are telecast, and have been applied to the broadcasting of the hearings of royal commissions and judicial inquiries. Indeed, it was journalists themselves who proposed that reasonable guidelines be imposed.

Very important work is carried on in committees, and the Standing Committee felt that it was unfortunate that Canadians were denied the opportunity to see this. Since the House of Commons is often empty because Members are at committee meetings, it is only by being able to watch both parliamentary and committee proceedings that Canadians can form the whole picture. It has been suggested that one reason for the media emphasis on Question Period is that the other work of Parliamentarians, especially committee work, could not be broadcast.

Committee meetings tend to be relatively informal and collegial; there was some concern that this would change if cameras were allowed in, but the Standing Committee felt, on the basis of the experience elsewhere, that such fears were groundless. Question Period and other House proceedings tend to involve government ministers, and a few other Members of Parliament, whereas televising committee work would enable Canadians to see ordinary Members of Parliament at work.

It is interesting that in the United States Congress and other legislative bodies the proceedings of committee meetings were allowed to be broadcast long before those of the legislature. The print media already have the right to attend public meetings, take notes and report on what is being said and done. As the Standing Committee's report noted, "On the

basis of equity, it is argued that the electronic media should be entitled to use the tools of their trade."

Besides assisting the press to gather news, it was claimed that the televising of committee meetings would also allow Canadians to follow specific issues or concerns; much of the work done by committees is either not reported extensively or is summarized and filtered through the media. The CPaC proposal would have involved the broadcasting of gavel to gavel coverage of selected committee hearings, similar to the practice of the C-SPAN cable channel in the U.S., which televises congressional committees. The Special Committee on Elections, Privileges, Procedure and Private Members' Business suggested that, if funds were available, two committee rooms should be equipped for broadcasting. Committees meeting in these rooms would be televised as part of the CPaC programming. The Committee felt that the chairmen of the committees would be able to sort out scheduling and the selection of committees, but that, if they were unable to do so, a committee of members would be able to arbitrate.

The report of the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges, Procedure and Private Members' Business was not concurred in by the House of Commons, although a motion was passed endorsing the CPaC proposal in principle. Meanwhile, the Standing Committee (re-named the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections) tabled a number of reports on various enhancements to the parliamentary channel, including the daily re-broadcasting of House proceedings to capture more viewers, the telecasting of informational videos, and the provision of information about parliamentary committees. Many of these proposals were endorsed by the House, and introduced on an interim basis.

HOUSE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

On 11 April 1991, the House of Commons adopted amendments to the Standing Orders. For the first time, these included provisions for committee proceedings to be broadcast:

119.1. (1) Any committee wishing to use the facilities of the House of Commons for the broadcasting of its meetings shall first obtain the consent of the House thereto.

(2) The Standing Committee on House Management shall establish, by report to the House of Commons, experimental guidelines governing the broadcasting of committee meetings. After concurrence by the House in such a report, any committee may permit the presence of the electronic media at its meetings, subject to the said guidelines.

Accordingly, the Standing Committee on House Management, chaired by Albert Cooper, M.P., undertook a study and review specifically of the broadcasting of committee proceedings in the autumn of 1991, and tabled its report in February 1992. The Committee recommended that the audio feed of all public committee meetings should be made available throughout Parliament Hill, and could be recorded by the media. It was proposed that initially one committee room should be equipped for video taping the proceedings of all committees meetings held there; the tapes would be made available to the media, and broadcast as part of the parliamentary channel programming. Committees would decide themselves if they wished a meeting to be broadcast. If more than one committee wanted to be broadcast at the same time, the matter would be referred to the House Leaders for a decision, and, if they could not agree, to the House Management Committee. The recording of committee proceedings would be undertaken by the House of Commons, subject to the same general guidelines, rules and policies as applied to the proceedings of the House itself. Thus, the decision was made in favour of having gavel-to-gavel coverage, rather than allowing the electronic media themselves to record or film committee proceedings.

The House Management Committee's report was concurred in by the House of Commons, and the broadcasting of committee proceedings began on an experimental basis in the spring of 1992. The Standing Orders of the House were also amended to provide that the House Management Committee would be responsible for the ongoing monitoring of the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its committees.

After several months' experience, the Committee recommended that the broadcasting of committee proceedings be made permanent. The Committee noted that the experience had been very successful, and that both Members and the public were pleased with

the experiment.⁽⁵⁾ This report was concurred in by the House on 28 April 1993. The audio distribution of committee proceedings through the parliamentary buildings also began in the spring of 1993.

In a separate report, the Standing Committee on House Management proposed that the guidelines for televising Question Period should be loosened somewhat to permit the use of different and wider camera angles and thus provide a more accurate presentation of the House. After this report had been approved by the House on an experimental basis and the recommendations implemented, even those who had been opposed to them were pleased with the results. The new guidelines were later extended, and there was further experimentation with camera angles in an effort to introduce greater flexibility to the televising of the House, and to better convey the full flavour of its proceedings. On 11 December 1992, the House agreed to make permanent the new camera angles for Question Period and the taking of divisions. The Standing Committee continues to monitor and work with the broadcasting staff of the House "to produce a more accurate visual image of the House."

REGULATION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY CHANNEL

In 1977 and 1978, as an interim measure, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) authorized cable systems to carry the House of Commons proceedings on their special programming channels, or community channels. At the time, the programming consisted of a videotaped replay of earlier proceedings, except in the National Capital Region, where it was carried live.

In 1979, the CBC received a temporary network licence to begin live, gavel-to-gavel distribution of House proceedings. Subsequently, the CRTC called for applications for a network licence. After a hearing in 1980, the CBC was issued a licence "to carry on a network to distribute the proceedings of the House of Commons and other programming material" in both official languages. The CRTC specifically limited the additional material that

(5) Standing Committee on House Management, Eighty-third Report, *Minutes*, Issue 53:145-147, 2 April 1993.

could be broadcast, and in fact CBC never developed the "wrap-around" programming even to the degree envisaged in the original application.

The CBC's network licences for distributing the proceedings of the House of Commons were renewed for short periods on a number of occasions. Several renewal hearings were scheduled, but were cancelled. Eventually, the CPaC proposal was developed, and an application was filed with the CRTC. The hearing of the CPaC application by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission was postponed a number of times. When the CBC's licences for the service came up for renewal, the CRTC indicated that it wanted to deal with the CPaC proposal, or a fresh application from the CBC, within six months. Even after the CBC announced in 1990 that it would discontinue financing the distribution of the parliamentary channel, it continued to hold the licences, pending a final resolution of the matter.

Following the enactment of a new *Broadcasting Act*, the CRTC issued in 1992 an exemption order for "House of Commons and provincial or territorial legislature proceedings."⁽⁶⁾ If certain criteria are met, the distribution of proceedings of legislative bodies is exempt from licence requirements of the Act.

THE PARLIAMENTARY CHANNEL: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

On 29 November 1990, the President of the CBC, Mr. Gérard Veilleux, told the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections that due to budgetary constraints, he would be recommending to the Corporation's Board of Directors that the CBC discontinue its funding of the expenditures of the Parliamentary Channel as of 1 April 1991, the start of the new fiscal year. Subsequently, on 5 December 1990, the CBC announced various cutbacks and closures. The news release included the following statement: "The Corporation has also indicated to the government that it is no longer able to bear the cost of operating the English- and French-language parliamentary channels. The government will seek the views of the Speaker of the House and consider means of maintaining the service."

(6) CRTC, Public Notice 1992-6, 17 January 1992, *House of Commons and Provincial or Territorial Legislature Proceedings Exemption Order*.

Subsequently, the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons considered a number of options for the continued broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings. In March 1991, the Board invited proposals from interested and qualified parties to operate a national satellite distribution network for the daily televised proceedings of the House of Commons. It indicated that it was interested in receiving proposals for each of the following: the continuation of a service similar to that being offered currently; the provision of a reduced service; and the provision of an enhanced version of the service. According to the Board: "A reduced service could be based on a more economical approach to providing the service by using, for example, only one transponder. An enhanced service could include additional non-partisan public affairs programming during times when the House is not sitting." The deadline for submitting proposals was 1 May 1991. The Board of Internal Economy indicated that it would assist any accepted proposal in making submissions to obtain a broadcast licence to operate the service and to obtain the necessary satellite transponders.

In order to avoid any interruption of the broadcast of House proceedings, the Board entered into a one-year contract with the CBC, to continue its operation of the service, beginning 1 April 1991. Under the new arrangement, the CBC was asked to distribute the proceedings of the House using one satellite transponder only. This continued to allow the distribution of the proceedings in English and French with floor sound and sign language, but meant the end of the televised introductions. These changes to the format were introduced during the summer of 1991. This interim arrangement allowed other proposals to be developed and approved. The contract with the CBC contained an opting-out clause that allowed the House of Commons to terminate the agreement on 90 days' notice to the CBC.

In 1992, the House of Commons entered into a new arrangement for the distribution of its proceedings and the proceedings of committees. A consortium of 25 cable companies formed Cable Parliamentary Channel Inc./*La chaîne parlementaire par câble inc.* (CPAC). CPAC assumed responsibility for the satellite distribution of the daily proceedings of the House and its committees and the replays of Question Period. The House continued to be responsible for the taping of proceedings and providing a live feed and videotaped replays. Originally for a two-year term, it was indicated that the arrangement would save the House of Commons the annual \$2-million cost of distributing the House signal via satellite.

The new agreement grants CPAC decision-making authority with respect to the programming on the channel, while guaranteeing that proceedings of the House and its committees would have priority access. Wrap-around programming would require temporary network licences, and CPAC has undertaken to advise the Speaker before making any such applications to the CRTC.

CONCLUSIONS

The broadcasting of the House of Commons performs an important function in enabling Canadians to see their elected representatives at work, and in making politicians accountable to their electors. Greater flexibility in filming the proceedings in the House has been suggested as a means of better conveying the work and flavour of the House's proceedings. It remains to be seen how the broadcasting of committee proceedings will develop. All these proposals are designed to enhance the openness of the system, and the public's access to parliamentary proceedings.

Television and radio are pervasive influences in our society, and legislatures cannot remain immune. The challenge is to use the electronic media so as to exploit the opportunities they offer, without compromising the integrity of Parliament. This seems to have been largely achieved in the Canadian House of Commons; indeed, the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges, Procedure and Private Members' Business and the Standing Committee on House Management were intended to build on what has been accomplished to date. As experience accumulates, and technology develops, still further re-evaluation and review of the broadcasting of House of Commons proceedings will be necessary, for this is an ongoing exercise.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Library of Parliament. Bibliography No. 175, *Broadcasting of Parliamentary Proceedings*.

ACCOPRESS®

NO. 2507

BF - RED	BY - YELLOW
BG - BLACK	BA - TANGERINE
BD - GREY	BB - ROYAL BLUE
BU - BLUE	BX - EXECUTIVE RED
BP - GREEN	

SPECIFY NO. & COLOR CODE

ACCO CANADIAN COMPANY LTD.
TORONTO CANADA

